

REMARKS

The Advisory Action mailed September 30, 2009, indicates that the Amendment of September 3, 2009, **will be entered** for purposes of appeal. **Applicants request entry of such Amendment**, and **then** further entry of the Amendment presented above.

The amendments presented above relate to the residual dye rate and its definition, support being found in Applicants' specification at pages 23-26 under the heading "Experiment" commencing at line 20 of page 23.

With respect to patentability of the present claims, Applicants first respectfully repeat by reference the remarks of the Reply filed September 3, 2009, on which Applicants continue to rely.

As regards the Namba citation, Applicants have pointed out the Namba teaches away from the combination of a counter ion of Formula (I) and a cyanine dye cation, other than that represented by Formula (II) of Namba, as well as the combination of a counter ion other than that represented by Formula (I) in a cyanine dye cation Formula (II). Applicants do not see that the PTO has answered or rebutted Applicants' arguments as should be done, according to the MPEP.

Applicants have also argued that Namba does not enable the person of ordinary skill in the art to practice Applicants' invention.

Applicants further pointed out in the Reply of September 3, 2009, the various deficiencies of Hohsaka et al and Sun, and pointed out that the prior art provides no reason for even attempting to combine these diverse documents. If the rejection is to be maintained, and hopefully the rejection will

be withdrawn and the claims allowed, Applicants would request that the PTO point out why (in the view of the Examiner) the Applicants are believed to be incorrect.

Above and beyond the remarks of the preceding Reply, Applicants have now added to the claims the residual dye rate and its definition as supported at pages 23-26 of the present specification. This now sets forth **additional** subject matter which is not shown or made obvious by the prior art. Table 1 on page 25 of Applicants' specification shows that surprisingly improved residual dye rate percentage achieved according to the present invention, and this is well beyond what could have been reasonably expected from the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By



Sheridan Neimark  
Registration No. 20,520

SN:ltm  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\S\SUMA\Aizawa1\Pto\2009-10-13 second AMD\_AF.doc